

THIS OPINION WAS NOT WRITTEN FOR PUBLICATION

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 16

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte ADIEL ABILEAH

Appeal No. 96-0871
Application 08/177,858¹

HEARD: FEBRUARY 10, 1999

Before BARRETT, FLEMING and DIXON, ***Administrative Patent Judges.***

FLEMING, ***Administrative Patent Judge.***

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 and 3 through 7. Claims 12 and 13 have been allowed

¹ Application for patent filed January 5, 1994. According to appellant, the application is a continuation-in-part of Application 08/031,120, filed March 12, 1993, now abandoned.

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

by the Examiner. Claims 2 and 8 through 11 have been canceled.

The invention relates to backlit liquid crystal display devices (LCDs) having a first light source for operation during the day, and a separate and independent second light source for operation at night. On page 42 of the specification, Appellant discloses that Figure 10 illustrates the proper positioning of an integral image-splitting/collimating lens 302, an EL night lamp 398 and a serpentine daytime lamp 300. In particular, on pages 43 and 44 of the specification, Appellant discloses that the spacing between the parallel daytime light sources 300 is an important parameter to the achievement of substantially uniform light from either the daytime light sources 300 or the EL night lamp 398. Appellant discloses that by manufacturing the backlighting system so that the inner diameter of the daytime sources 300, " D_i ", is equal to the gap, " T ", between the inner peripheries of adjacent daytime light sources, the backlighting from either the daytime light sources 300 or the EL night lamp 398 results in substantially uniform

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

illumination produced by the integral image-
splitting/collimating lens 302.

The independent claim 1 is reproduced and is appended to
this decision.

The Examiner relies on the following references:

Abileah et al. (Abileah)	5,161,041	Nov. 3, 1992
Farrell	5,143,433	Sept. 1, 1992
Military Standard	MIL-L-85762A	Aug. 26, 1988

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as
being unpatentable over Abileah in view of Farrell. Claims 3
through 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being
unpatentable over Abileah in view of Farrell and Military
Standard MIL-L-85762A.

Rather than reiterate the arguments of Appellant and the
Examiner, reference is made to the briefs² and answers³ for the

² Appellant filed an appeal brief on February 13, 1995.
We will refer to this appeal brief as simply the brief.
Appellants filed a reply appeal brief on July 31, 1995. The
Examiner responded to the reply brief with a supplemental
Examiner's answer thereby entering and considering the reply
brief.

³ The Examiner responded to the brief with an Examiner's
answer, mailed June 1, 1995. We will refer to the Examiner's
answer as simply the answer. The Examiner responded to the
reply brief with supplemental Examiner's answer mailed

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

respective details thereof.

OPINION

We will not sustain the rejection of claims 1 and 3 through 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Examiner has failed to set forth a ***prima facie*** case. It is the burden of the Examiner to establish why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to the claimed invention by the express teachings or suggestions found in the prior art, or by implications contained in such teachings or suggestions. ***In re Sernaker***, 702 F.2d 989, 995, 217 USPQ 1, 6 (Fed. Cir. 1983). "Additionally, when determining obviousness, the claimed invention should be considered as a whole; there is no legally recognizable 'heart' of the invention." ***Para-Ordnance Mfg., Inc. v. SGS Importers Int'l, Inc.***, 73 F.3d 1085, 1087, 37 USPQ2d 1237, 1239 (Fed. Cir. 1995), ***cert. denied***, 117 S.Ct. 80 (1996) ***citing W. L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.***, 721 F.2d 1540, 1548, 220 USPQ 303, 309 (Fed. Cir. 1983), ***cert. denied***, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).

Appellant argues on pages 6-8 of the brief that neither

September 13, 1995.

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

Abileah nor Farrell teach or suggest Appellants' unique lighting element spacing that ensures uniform and non-saturating lighting during nighttime activities. Appellant's independent claim 1 sets forth "two spaced apart light emitting members each having an inner diameter defining an inner periphery and an outer diameter defining an outer periphery thereof, wherein said gap is defined as the distance between said inner peripheries of said two spaced apart light emitting members, said gap being of substantially the same width as each of said inner diameters of said spaced apart light emitting members." Appellant argues that nowhere is it taught or suggested to modify Abileah to space the light emitting members of the first or daytime source a distance T apart where gap T is substantially equal to the inner diameter distance of each of the first source light emitting members.

The Federal Circuit states that "[t]he mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." **In re Fritch**, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266 n.14, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

n.14 (Fed. Cir. 1992), ***citing In re Gordon***, 733 F.2d 900, 902, 221 USPQ 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Upon a closer review of Abileah, we agree with the Examiner that Abileah fails to teach second light source. Furthermore, we fail to find that Abileah teaches or suggests the spacing of the first light source members such that the gap defined between the inner peripheries of two spaced apart first light source members a distance that is substantially the same as the inner diameters of the first light source members. In particular, we find that Abileah is silent to this spacing in the specification. We further note that Abileah does show the spacings in Figures 2A and 7 and these spacings are much greater than Appellant's claimed spacings.

Turning to Farrell, we fail to find that Farrell teaches or suggests the spacing of the first light source members such that the gap defined between the inner peripheries of two spaced apart first light source members a distance that is substantially the same as the inner diameters of the first light source members. As with Abileah, Farrell is silent as

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

to this spacing in the specification. However, when Farrell illustrates the spacing in the drawing, Farrell shows the spacings that spacings are much greater than Appellant's claimed spacings. See Farrell's Figures 1, 2, 8 and 9.

The Examiner has failed to show that the prior art suggested the desirability of the Examiner's proposed modification. We are not inclined to dispense with proof by evidence when the proposition at issue is not supported by a teaching in a prior art reference or shown to be common knowledge of unquestionable demonstration. Our reviewing court requires this evidence in order to establish a ***prima facie*** case. ***In re Knapp-Monarch Co.***, 296 F.2d 230, 232, 132 USPQ 6, 8 (CCPA 1961); ***In re Cofer***, 354 F.2d 664, 668, 148 USPQ 268, 271-72 (CCPA 1966). Therefore, we find that the Examiner has failed to establish why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to the claimed invention by teachings or suggestions found in the prior art.

We have not sustained the rejection of claims 1 and 3 through 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, the Examiner's decision is reversed.

REVERSED

LEE E. BARRETT)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
MICHAEL R. FLEMING)	BOARD OF PATENT
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
JOSEPH L. DIXON)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

Myers, Liniak & Berenato
6550 Rock Spring Drive, Ste. 240
Bethesda, MD 20817

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

MRF/ki

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

APPENDIX

circle, and is further so located with respect to said
of said first joint source with respect to said matrix
wherein said second joint source is so located relative
joint emitting members:

as each of said inner diameters of said spaced apart
members, said gap being of substantially the same width
between the two spaced apart joint emitting
said gap is defined as the distance between said inner
diameters defining an outer boundary thereof, wherein
diameters defining an inner boundary and an outer
apart joint emitting members each having an inner
size so as to define a gap therebetween, said two spaced
apart joint emitting members of substantially the same

as said first joint source, at least two, spaced
combined:

source said joint shall be emitted, the involvement
further including means for selecting from within joint
sources for said circle, said means for determining joint
matrix circle further to create a pair of opposite joint
sources being so located relative of said rear side of said
a second joint source, said first and second joint
said matrix circle within including a first joint source and
including means for determining joint to be based further
and a rear side, and wherein said diameter further
discuss elements, said matrix circle having a defined side
matrix circle of some and columns of joint circle

1. In a joint circle diameter within including a

Appeal No. 96-0871
Serial No. 08/177,858

upon the least edge of any warlike spirit.
 supernatural spiritual devotion of itself for independence
 by any wage-spiritual means are collected to create a
 itself source within itself, the spirit-wages therefore formed
 edge of the warlike spirit, and also that when any second
 spiritual devotion of itself for independence upon the least
 spiritual means are collected to create a supernatural
 spirit, spiritual wages therefore formed by any wage-
 also that when any first itself source within itself the
 itself sources and beyond absence from any itself sources
 means beyond joined between any warlike spirit and any
 itself source within itself therefore, any wage-spiritual
 of any first and second itself sources when any one
 spiritual means for biological two, spiritual wages of one
 and therefore any spiritual further includes wage-
 workers of any first itself source:
 biological of any two absence absent itself within
 biological into and finally any day between the inner
 itself within from any second itself source directed
 first itself source also that a supernatural portion of the